

REMARKS

Claims 12, 13 and 15 are pending in the application. Claims 12 and 13 have been amended. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is noted with appreciation that the Office Action has indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and of any intervening claims. The base claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 14 and a portion of intervening claim 13. In particular, the language of "unit of processing called 'transforms'" has been incorporated into claim 12 and the language of "unit of work called 'packets'" and "unit of transportation called 'ports'" has been omitted and retained in dependent claim 13. It is submitted that the above noted omission from amended claim 12 does not affect its allowability.

Accordingly, it is submitted that amended independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 13 and 15 are now in condition to be allowed.

The Office Action rejects claims 12 and 15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,435 to Caldato et al., hereafter Caldato.

This rejection is obviated by the amendment to claim 12 incorporating the language of claim 14, which was not so rejected.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 12, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,429 to Merritt et al., hereafter Merritt.

This rejection is obviated by the amendment to independent claim 12 incorporating the language of claim 14, which was indicated as allowable. It is noted that Merritt does not disclose or teach the following elements as recited in claim 1:

“at least first and second units of processing called “transforms” configured in a dynamic pipeline to perform said specific sequence of atomic operations, wherein said first and second transforms process data in a context independent fashion, that being there is not implied knowledge coupled between said first and second transforms influencing the means of process data”.

Merritt’s conversion control processor 26 selects one of the conversion processors 27 (column 7, lines 12-22) and not “at least first and second units of processing called “transforms” configured in a dynamic pipeline to perform said specific sequence of atomic operations”. Moreover, Merritt does not disclose or teach that the “first and second transforms process data in a context independent fashion, that being there is not implied knowledge coupled between said first and second transforms influencing the means of process data”. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 13 and 15 are also allowable.


For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 12, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Merritt is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double

patenting and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn, that claims 12, 13 and 15 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 11/11/05


Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500